

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over LeCain (WO 03/104884) in view of Ogura(US 5,739,888).

In the rejection, the Examiner contends that LeCain discloses most of the features recited in claim 1, but concedes that LeCain fails to disclose a plurality of spacers arranged on a surface in a sealing agent portion that is located on the outer periphery of a display. To compensate for this deficiency, the Examiner applies Ogura alleging it teaches of using plural spacers 11 within a sealing agent 10 that is disposed along an outer periphery of a display device. *Citing* FIG. 1, col. 6, lines 33-60.

In Ogura, as shown in Fig. 1 of Ogura, a plurality of glass beads 11 are arranged in a sealing agent 10. However, Ogura is directed to a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel in which beads having a diameter no larger than 10 μm are used with a glass substrate. In this regard, the problems to be solved and structures between the claimed invention are largely different as follows.

(a) Difference of the problems to be solved:

The problems to be solved by the claimed invention relate to flexible substrates, not glass substrates. As noted in paragraph [0008] of the present specification:

Therefore, in the case of using a substrate having no flexibility such as a glass substrate as a front substrate 57, as shown in Fig. 7c, the front substrate 57 is not bent even

if the sealing agent 56 is arranged to the sealing agent arranging portion 55 and the front substrate 57 is connected to the rear substrate 51 by a pressing process utilizing a ram head 58. However, in the case of using a substrate having flexibility such as a resin substrate as the front substrate 57, as shown in Fig. 7d, there is a drawback such that the front substrate 57 is bent by the pressing process at the sealing agent arranging portion 55 and a gap between the front substrate and the rear substrate becomes uneven, if the sealing agent 56 is arranged to the sealing agent arranging portion 55 and the front substrate 57 is connected to the rear substrate 51 by the pressing process utilizing the ram head 58. Moreover, it is concerned that a stress occurs due to a hardening and shrinking of the sealing agent 56. As a result, as shown in Fig. 7e, there is also a drawback such that a conductive pass 59 due to a carbonization of the sealing agent 56 by its tracking is generated and the information display panel is broken.

Clearly, Ogura does not relate to the problems of the claimed invention.

(b) Difference of the structures:

If the claimed invention and Ogura are compared, the spacer arranging portion (sealing agent arranging portion) is the same, but the spacers are clearly different. As to the spacers, Ogura uses beads and the claimed invention uses the partition walls. Moreover, as to a size of the spacers, since a distance between the substrates of Ogura using an LCD panel is short, and a distance between the substrates of the claimed invention is long, a diameter of the beads of Ogura is not larger than 10 μm . Thus, there is a large structural difference between the claimed invention in which a height of the partition walls is several tens of μm .

(2) As to arguments:

Applicants submit the Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness because one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify LeCain in view of Ogura as alleged by the Examiner.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Appln No.: 10/588,648

(a) First, the problems to be solved of the claimed invention using flexible substrates do not occur in the panel using the glass substrates. Ogura uses glass substrates, and thus, one of skill in the art, who intends to overcome the problems of the panel using the flexible substrates, would not rely on Ogura's structure for modification. That is, one of skill would not modify LeCain in view of Ogura as alleged.

(b) Second, Ogura discloses a technique particularly related to an LCD panel in which the distance between the substrates is short. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not apply Ogura to the structure of LeCain. Also, Ogura does not relate to the panel of the claimed invention in which the distance between the substrates is long. If the technique disclosed in Ogura is applied to the panel of the present invention, it is necessary to arranged large beads having a diameter of several tens of μm in the scaling agent, and thus an amount of the beads and an amount of the scaling agents become an unbalanced state.

(c) Further, the beads of Ogura have a circular (spherical) shape, if the beads of Ogura are applied to a panel, a local stress occurs between the flexible substrates and the beads when the substrates are laminated, and the substrates are liable to be broken (the glass substrates are not deformed due to the local stress, but the flexible substrates are deformed by the local stress).

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness because one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine LeCain and Ogura as suggested.

Thus, claims 1-6 are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Appln No.: 10/588,648

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

Date: March 27, 2012